Approved For Release 2001/07/26: CIA-RDP70B00338R000200010059-1

16 February 1968

File: Senate Foreign Relations

CROSS REFERENCE SHEET

SUBJECT:

Compilation of US Government obligations for FY-1967

for external research in foreign area social and behavioral

sciences.

STATINTL

FROM:

Chief, DDI/SRS Room 1H1122 Hqs.

ORIG. FILED: Sen. Government Operations Committee

NY TIMES 16 FEGS

FULBRIGHT OUERY ATTACKED BY RUSK

But Senator Rejects Charge That Atomic Arms Debate Is Disservice to Nation

> By JOHN W. FINNEY Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Feb. 15 Secretary of State Dean Rusk has suggested that Senator J. W. Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, did a disservice to the country by raising questions about the possible use of nuclear weapons in Vietnam.

In a reply, Senator Fulbright rejected "the implication that the discussion of the subject of use of nuclear weapons in Vietnam is a disservice to the nation."

"I believe it would be a grave disservice to our country, in truth a disaster, if our leadership should so expose our troops in Vietnam as to require nuclear weapons to prevent their destruction," the Arkansas Democrat said in a statement today.

The Secretary of State and the Senate's chief foreign policy spokesman became involved in: the angry public exchange after the State Department, without the advance knowledge or approval of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, took the initiative in making public a letter Mr. Rusk wrote to the Senator last Saturday.

The letter was in reply to

Continued on Page 2, Column 4

one written by Mr. Fulbright last Friday inquiring, on behalf of the committee, whether the Administration intended to introduce nuclear weapons into South Vietnam.

The Fulbright letter noted that the committee had received a report from an anonymous source that Prof. Richard L. Garwin of Columbia University and other physicists who in the past had had some connection with the development of tactical nuclear weapons had been sent urgently to Vietnam.

As a result of the report, the letter said, several committee members suggested that the chairman ask Mr. Rusk about the nature of the Garwin mission and "ascertain whether tactical nuclear weapons have been or would be deployed in South Vietnam."

In a brusque, two-paragraph reply, Mr. Rusk said Dr. Garwin, as a Defense Department consultant, had gone to Viet-nam "to discuss technical matters of a nonnuclear nature."

The Rusk letter, however, did not directly answer the ques-tion whether there were any plans to deploy tactical nuclear weapons in Vietnam, Instead, weapons in Victnam. Instead, by quoting a statement by the White House press secretary, George Christian, Mr. Rusk suggested that the Senator was being irresponsible and performing a national disservice by raising the question.

Simply 'Sincerely'

The Rusk letter said:

"As George Christian said vesterday in response to a quest to use tactical nuclear President had received a request to use tactial nuclear weapons in Vietnam under cer-tain circumstances: I think all of you know that decisions of this nature rest with the President. The President has considered no decision of this na-ture. I might add that irre-sponsible discussion and speculation are a disservice to the country, and I don't intend to say anything more about the subject."

Mr. Rusk ended his letter with a simple "Sincerely"—in marked contrast to the normal courtesies contained in a letter to the Senate committee.

The brusqueness of the letter, combined with its implied charges against the committee chairman, provoked considerable indignation among some other members of the commit-

Relations between Mr. Rusk and the committee were already strained, and it appeared that the effect of the letter might be to break off communications between the Secretary and the committee.

committee.
Senator George D. Aiken of Vermont, a ranking Republican on the committee, came to the defense of Senator Fulbright by saying the Rusk letter was "about as irresponsible as General Wheeler's statement that he wouldn't use nuclear weapons unless we begin to get the worst of it in the battle of Khesanh."

the first step toward a general nuclear conflict in which in calculable destruction would result."

The tone of the Rusk letter was interpreted on Capitol Hill as a manifestation of the irritable mood of high Administration officials, including Mr. Rusk, over the adverse turn of events in Victnam.

Senator Aiken said: "Things

Suggests 'New Faces'

Without specifically suggesting that Mr. Rusk should resign, Senator Aiken said; "Maybe we need some fresh new faces downtown."

In that Indicate that all 15 hours are the Administration; if things had been going well, they would have tossed it (the Fulbright letter] off."

From the Administration side, hours are the avalenting well for the Administration side, hours are the area of the avalenting well for the Administration side, hours are the avalent to the Administration of the Administration well for the Administration side, hours are the Administration of the Administration well for the Administration with the Administration of the Administration well for the Administration with the Administration well for the Admin

the use of nuclear weapons was Vietnam. being excluded in the event the marine outpost in northwest South Vietnam was in danger pointed out, the committee let of being overrrun by North Vietnamese forces.

Senator Fullwight in the desired in the committee let output for the committee let

was made public, also referred to the Wheeler statement, which he said "leaves the impression that, if needed to defend Khesanh, they [nuclear weapons] would be used."

"I believe that some other alternative for protecting our troops should be found," he

Observing that he was "profoundly opposed to having the United States destroy the worldwide psychological bar-rier against the use of nuclear weapons which has thus far existed since Hiroshima and Nagasaki," the Fulbright state-

ment said:
"Since we are the only nation which has used nuclear weapons in anger to destroy weapons in anger to destroy the lives of Asian people, we have a very special respon-sibility not again to use these weapons, not in effect to take

Senator Aiken said: "Things like that indicate that all is not

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chair-however, came the capacitation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from State Department officials that the letter reflected indigin a statement to reporters yesterday said he did "not think
nuclear weapons will be required to defend Khesanh" but
then refused to "speculate any
further" when asked whether
the use of nuclear weapons might be used in
Vietnam

Instead of making private Victnamese forces.
Senator Fulbright, in his statement after the Rusk letter of nuclear weapons to Vietnam.